

REMARKSResponse to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22 and 29-33, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,914,695 issued to Walters, et al in view of Rathbone and further in view of Sony Corporation, PC Connecting Kit. The rejection asserts that Walters allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for disclosing mapping protocol when the peripheral is not successfully identified to the corresponding resident program and mapping the resident program, which is allegedly taught by Rathbone and Sony.

The claims are directed toward mapping a resident program to a peripheral device, either by identifying the peripheral device or if the device cannot be identified, then by the communication protocol specified by the peripheral device. Each of the independent claims require if the peripheral device is identified *“mapping from the identified peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs”* and if the peripheral device is not identified *“mapping from a communication protocol specified by said peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs.”* Thus, the peripheral device is mapped to a resident program by either the identity of the resident device, or lacking a proper identity, the communication protocol of the resident device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests mapping of a peripheral device to a resident program in that manner. The Office Action admits that Walters does not teach this mapping. The office action asserts that Rathbone teaches mapping protocol when the peripheral is not successfully identified to the corresponding resident program. The office action continues to assert that Rathbone teaches prompting for installation of peripheral device according to a communication protocol. Applicants respectfully assert that is not what Rathbone teaches at all. In the claims, if the peripheral device is not identified, *the communication protocol specified by*

the peripheral device is then mapped to a corresponding program. Thus, the present claims look to the communication protocol used by the peripheral device, and then maps a corresponding program. Rathbone simply states “[i]f yours isn’t automatically accepted, use the software that came with your scanner or camera.. It should still work—you just won’t be able to use Window’s XP’s built-in software.” Thus, Rathbone simply teaches a manual method of installing the appropriate software if the device is not recognized. There is nothing in Rathbone to even suggest that the communication protocol is examined or used at all. In fact, in Rathbone, the program is not selected by a communications protocol, but rather manually by the user by selecting the software that was supplied by the camera. In fact, Rathbone never even suggests that this software will ever be mapped properly.

Further, Sony does not teach examination of the communication protocol and software mapping. Sony simply discloses alternative techniques for connecting the camera to the computer (such as by cable or infrared port). Sony also teaches installing the software that comes with the camera (page 23). However, nothing in Sony teaches or even suggests that a communication protocol is ever examined to determine which software program to use. In fact, the concept of examining a communication protocol is never mentioned anywhere in either Rathbone or Sony.

After extensive review of the cited art, none of the art ever teaches or suggests *mapping from a communication protocol specified by said peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs* when the peripheral device is not detected. All the cited art discloses is manually installing the supplied software, and the concept of mapping from a communication protocol is never suggested. Thus, none of the cited art can be said to teach this element of the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 29, 33 and 35-36.

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 29, 33 and 35-36, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated February 22, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/
James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502